

New Attorney Docket No.: E6024-038
(Old Docket No. 061049-0021)
App. Serial No.: 10/561,888
Art Unit: 3677

REMARKS

The examiner has imposed a restriction requiring the Applicant to elect a single invention from the following:

- I. Claims 1-30 and 47-52, drawn to a hinge, classified in class 16, subclass 354.
- II. Claims 31-46, drawing to a method of forming a hinge leaf, classified in class 29, subclass 11.

Applicant hereby elects the invention of Group I drawn to the hinge without traverse.

With the election of Group I, the examiner further requires Applicant to elect a single species for prosecution on the merits if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable (Office Action, page 3). The examiner has identified claim 3 as being generic.

Applicant hereby respectfully elects the species of Figure 4A with traverse, for the reasons noted below. Claims 1-28, 30, and 47-52 read on the elected invention of Group I and the species of FIG. 4A.

Applicant respectfully submits that the hinge shown in FIG. 6 (listed on page 3 of the Office Action as a distinct species) is structurally and otherwise the same hinge shown in FIG. 4A, but shown as installed on a pair of hinged objects (*please see* Applicant's disclosure, paragraph 0071). In fact, the description of FIG. 6 in Applicant's paragraph 0071 follows discussion of the hinge of FIG. 4A in preceding paragraphs 0068-0070. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the hinge of FIG. 6 is not distinct from the species of FIG. 4A, and requests that the elected species of FIG. 4A be considered during prosecution to include the hinge of FIG. 6.

Applicant further respectfully submits that the hinge shown in FIG. 8 (listed on page 3 of the Office Action as a distinct species) is structurally and otherwise the same hinge shown in

New Attorney Docket No. : E6024-038
(Old Docket No. 061049-0021)]
App. Serial No.: 10/561,888
Art Unit: 3677

FIG. 4A, but shown in perspective view to illustrate the longitudinal extent of the continuous hinge of FIG. 4A. In Applicant's paragraph 0077, it is noted that "FIGS. 8-12 provide various perspective views of a partial length of the continuous hinge 1 shown in FIGS. 4A-C, and described in detail above, as continuous hinges may extend for substantially the entire length of the joined portion of a hinged object." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the hinge of FIG. 8 is not distinct from the species of FIG. 4A, and requests that the elected species of FIG. 4A be considered during prosecution to include the hinge of FIG. 8.

Should there be any questions regarding this response or related issues, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative directly at 215.979.1554 if a phone call could help resolve any outstanding issues and expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 23, 2007

By: 

Frank J. Spanitz Reg. No. 47,104

CUSTOMER NO. 67812

Duane Morris LLP

968 Postal Road, Suite 110

Allentown, PA 18109-0400

Telephone: (215) 979-1550

Telecopier: (610) 264-3295